



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

open to us to say that in the text of Sennacherib the verb used seems to imply only that the inhabitants were "marched out," i.e., to give allegiance to Assyria, and were not taken into captivity for, which a quite different expression is used (see Rogers, *Hist. Bab. and Assyr.* [6th ed.], II 370, n. 1), and if he then allege that 200,150 is too large a number for the inhabitants of forty-six cities we shall gladly admit it, but insist that the population surely exceeded 150 souls! Has not Professor Olmstead spoken rashly of Sennacherib's historiographer as he has of modern historians who have "regularly" taken the "latest and worst edition" of the Assyrian inscriptions? But, laying aside the frivolous it seems to me that Olmstead's *Assyrian Historiography* is of the highest importance. He has made it clear that we do need to pay more earnest heed, not merely to use the sources, which most of us have done from Tiele to King, but to subject them to a more rigid sifting than any of us have consistently accomplished. And if this boon were not secured the little book would have great value for its bibliographical references, in which Olmstead displays a none too common mastery of the literature coupled with meticulous accuracy. I have indeed found amazingly few inaccuracies of any sort, and the proofreading has been skilfully done; we have only such slight slips as "statute" for "statue" (p. 20, n.) and André for the name of Walter André (p. 21, n. 1; p. 25, n. 4; p. 25, n. 3; and p. 29, n. 2).

ROBERT W. ROGERS

DREW THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

HASTINGS' DICTIONARY OF THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH¹

This work was undertaken in response to a widespread request for an encyclopedic dictionary which should do for the rest of the New Testament what the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* had already done for the Gospels. Hence, as the editor tells us in his brief preface, the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, taken in connection with the above-mentioned work, "forms a complete and independent Dictionary of the New Testament." It might also be described as comprehensive; for, like the other works edited by Dr. Hastings, it contains articles dealing with the language, history, criticism, theology, geography, and antiquities of the New Testament. Some subjects which were discussed in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* are also treated in the present volume;

¹ *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church.* Edited by James Hastings. New York: Scribner, 1916. Vol. I. xiv+729 pages. \$6.00.

but inasmuch as the reader could not be assumed to have both works, such duplication was in many cases necessary.

Of the 99 contributors to the first volume of the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, 83 are British and 9 American. Germany is represented by Thumb, von Dobschütz, and von Schlatter, and France by Batiffol. With the exception of the latter, who is a Catholic priest, the writers are all Protestants. It is hardly necessary to say that, in spite of important differences of various sorts, all of them accept the critical point of view and use the scientific methods of modern scholarship.

It is customary to regard the Apostolic Age as closing with the death of the apostle John, which is commonly believed to have occurred about 100 A.D. The present dictionary, however, despite its title, contains matter pertaining to the second century as well as to the first. For example, we have a valuable article on Ignatius by Batiffol, a good discussion of the Apocryphal Acts by Lake and de Zwaan, and a very thorough article on the Uncanonical Gospels by Moffatt. To have confined the work strictly to the limits of the Apostolic Age would have been a fatuous sacrifice to that foolish consistency which Emerson calls "the hobgoblin of little minds."

In a thoroughly satisfactory article on the Acts of the Apostles Professor Lake says concerning the authorship of the work: "The traditional view that Luke, the companion of St. Paul, was the editor of the whole book is the most reasonable one" (p. 20a). Acts has, to be sure, certain primitive characteristics; but Lake is certainly right in saying that "the weakening of the eschatological element, and the interest in the Church, as an institution in a world which is not immediately to disappear, point away from the very early date advocated by Harnack and others" (p. 21a). He thinks that on the whole the most probable date is the decade 90-100. As sources used in the compilation of the book he recognizes, besides the "we-sections," certain traditions derived from Antioch, Jerusalem, and Caesarea. "The theology of Acts is, on the whole, simple and early, showing no traces of Johannine, and surprisingly few of Pauline, influence" (p. 27b).

W. C. Allen accepts Harnack's view that Acts was written at the end of Paul's imprisonment in Rome, and makes this date the *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the Synoptic Gospels. Thus Mark falls between the years 30-50; Matthew was written about 50; and Luke is assigned to the period 47-60 (pp. 474 f.). Harnack's dating of Acts seems to the reviewer an insecure foundation to build upon, and he feels sure that most scholars will not agree with Allen's early dates for the Synoptic Gospels.

The command of the risen Christ to baptize the nations into the threefold name (Matt. 28:19) is undoubtedly a true part of the First Gospel. But the collocation of Christ, God, and the Holy Spirit in II Cor. 13:13 by no means proves that Jesus "made some such utterance" as that contained in the above-mentioned verse of Matthew, of which the latter is "a much abbreviated record" (p. 130a). All that can be said with confidence is that the words in question reflect the usage of the church, or of a section of it, in the last quarter of the first century. The Matthaean formula of baptism is probably only a liturgical expansion of the primitive formula preserved in Acts.

On p. 204b Plummer says: "We do not know who so happily adopted the word [ἐκκλησία] for Christian use. It is not impossible that Christ Himself may have used it, for He sometimes spoke Greek. He used it or its equivalent in a Christian sense (Matt. 16:18); but Matt. 18:17, though capable of being transferred to Christians, must at the time when it was spoken have meant a Jewish assembly." Can we assume that Matt. 16:17-19 is a genuine utterance of Jesus? Apart from difficulties of a different sort, these verses are not found in the parallel sections of Mark and Luke. So, too, in view of the adverse judgment of most critical scholars, we desire proof that Matt. 18:17, which is contained only in the First Gospel, is rightly ascribed to the Master. We are also told that beyond reasonable doubt the Christian community owes its origin to Jesus (p. 205a). Does this mean that he actually founded the church, or does it mean that the impetus which resulted in the establishment of the church originated with him? That the latter of these alternatives is true cannot be doubted.

In an article on dates Professor Zenos, feeling it necessary to find a place in Paul's life for the composition of the Pastoral Epistles, accepts as historical the release and second imprisonment of the apostle. On the basis of an inscription discovered at Delphi he concludes that Gallio entered upon the proconsulship of Achaia in the spring of 52 A.D. (pp. 275b f.). Deissmann, however, seems to the present writer to have shown that in all probability Gallio became proconsul in the summer of the year 51 (cf. *Paulus*, 1911, pp. 159-74). The determination of this matter is of great importance for the student of the Apostolic Age, because upon it depends the date of Paul's arrival in Corinth and the writing of the letters to the Thessalonians. Zenos places the accession of Festus as procurator of Judaea in the year 60 (p. 276), and thus ranges himself with those who agree with the testimony of Tacitus. In view of the conflicting data given by Josephus, Tacitus, and Eusebius this question is as difficult as it is important. Perhaps, on the whole, an earlier date,

October 55—October 56 (Harnack) or September 56—September 57 (Lake), is preferable.

The editor could have found no one better fitted to write on Hellenistic and biblical Greek than the late Professor Thumb, of Strassburg, and his contribution is an excellent résumé of the subject.

There are a number of articles dealing with various subjects in the field of biblical theology. Among these the reviewer would call attention to Platt's discussion of the atonement and to an article by C. A. Scott entitled "Christ, Christology." After examining the material contained in the New Testament, Platt concludes, against some recent writers, that a theory of the atonement "is potentially present and virtually expressed in the common experience and preaching of apostolic times where it is not formally defined" (p. 122a).

Much careful and conscientious work has gone into the making of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, and students, teachers, and ministers will find it a valuable book of reference for the field which it covers. The second volume is awaited with keen interest.

WILLIAM H. P. HATCH

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES

The data are so indefinite that apparently we shall never reach a "consensus of opinion" on certain of the New Testament books. And one of these is the Epistle of James. Professor Ropes's commentary¹ seems as fertile in new suggestions and points of view as any that have been written. The author maintains that the little book is—

a religious and moral tract having the form, but only the form, of a letter. . . . It is probably the pseudonymous production of a Christian of Jewish origin, living in Palestine in the last quarter of the first century or the first quarter of the second. . . . The epistle reflects the conditions of Jewish life in Palestine, and almost all the ideas have their roots in Jewish thought, but in much of the language, style, and mode of expression generally, and in some of the ideas, Hellenistic influences are unmistakable and strong. The interweaving of the two strains contributes much to the freshness and effectiveness of the epistle as a hortatory essay.²

¹ *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James.* By James Hardy Ropes. (The International Critical Commentary.) New York: Scribner. 1916. xiii+319 pages. \$3.00.

² P. 1.